

Jaime Reborn
Pro Se
209 Settlers Glen Trail, Arlington, TX 76002
817-793-9886
jaimereborn@yahoo.com

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

JAIME REBORN

Plaintiff(s),

VS.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS,

Defendant(s).

Case No.: 4-23CV-613-0

**VIOLATION OF SECTION 504 OF THE
1973 REHABILITATION ACT:**

**PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF
CLARIFICATION TO COURT
REGARDING DEFENDANT'S MOTION
TO CONTINUE TRIAL**

**NOTICE OF CLARIFICATION
REGARDING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO CONTINUE TRIAL**

COMES NOW Plaintiff, **Jaime Reborn**, proceeding pro se, respectfully submits this **Notice of Clarification to Court Regarding Defendant's Motion to Continue Trial** which is in reaction to **Defendant's Unopposed Motion to Continue Trial** which Defendant filed on July 25, 2025 (Dkt. 88).

Defendant's characterization of the motion as "unopposed" is premature and unfounded. The term "unopposed" implies that Plaintiff had already made a final and informed decision not to challenge the motion. However, at the time Defendant filed the motion, Plaintiff had not yet been

1 provided a copy, nor had Plaintiff even been made aware of its contents. It is not logically sound to
2 claim something is unopposed when there was nothing to oppose, and no opportunity for
3 meaningful review. Even assuming a general verbal agreement had occurred (which Plaintiff does
4 not concede), no such agreement can reasonably be considered final or binding without a written
5 version of the motion to confirm the accuracy of its contents and scope. Verbal summaries of legal
6 filings can be incomplete or contain inadvertent errors, and the only way a party, especially a pro se
7 litigant, can assess whether to oppose or support a motion is by reviewing it in its final written form.
8 Plaintiff had no opportunity to do so prior to the filing.
9

10 While Defendant has represented that Plaintiff “takes no position” and that the motion is
11 therefore “unopposed,” Plaintiff respectfully clarifies and states as follows:

- 12 1. Plaintiff was contacted by opposing counsel approximately 2–3 days prior to July 24, 2025,
13 but due to scheduling difficulties, the parties did not speak verbally until July 25, 2025, after
14 the deadline for coordinating joint filings pursuant to the Court’s Scheduling Order (Dkt.
15 48).
16
- 17 2. Plaintiff went into the telephonic meeting with the understanding that the communication
18 from Defendant’s counsel was intended to fulfill the Court-ordered obligation to coordinate
19 joint pretrial submissions, including the Joint Final Pretrial Order, deposition designations,
20 and other filings listed in the Scheduling Order. At no time was Plaintiff advised in advance
21 of the telephonic meeting that the Defendant intended to file a unilateral motion to continue
22 the trial or that there was to be a conversation of such during the telephonic conference.
23
- 24 3. Plaintiff did not receive a written or electronic copy of the Motion prior to its filing on July
25 25, 2025. Plaintiff only became aware of the existence and content of the motion after
26 locating it independently on the docket.
27

- 1 4. As a pro se litigant who is not a licensed attorney, Plaintiff was not in a position to give a
2 legal opinion, or to oppose or consent to a motion that he had not seen or reviewed. The
3 conversation on July 25 did not include disclosure of the motion's contents, and Defendant's
4 counsel did not provide a copy during or after that conversation.
- 5 5. Accordingly, Defendant's characterization of the motion as "unopposed" is premature and
6 misleading, as Plaintiff had not been given an opportunity to see the filing and was unaware
7 it would be submitted that day. The Defendant should not have prefaced the motion as
8 "unopposed" when no copy had been shared with Plaintiff for review.
- 9 6. Plaintiff's position should be more accurately understood as "unopposed at this time",
10 pending full review of the filing. Plaintiff reserves the right to file a substantive response or
11 objection after further consideration of the legal and procedural implications.
- 12 7. Plaintiff files this Notice in good faith to ensure the record accurately reflects the context of
13 the parties' communication and Plaintiff's position regarding the Defendant's motion.
- 14 8. Plaintiff had every intention of complying with the Court's instructions and deadlines as set
15 forth in the Scheduling Order, and has made every effort to do so in good faith. As a non-
16 lawyer and unrepresented party, Plaintiff relied on clear expectations from the Court and
17 anticipated that defense counsel would act consistently with those obligations, particularly in
18 regard to coordinating joint filings. Plaintiff could only respond after the fact to Defendant's
19 decision to unilaterally file a motion to delay the proceedings, which was neither previewed
20 nor shared in writing beforehand. Plaintiff's response has necessarily been reactive due to
21 the manner in which Defendant chose to proceed.
- 22 9. Plaintiff, again, would like to make it clear to the Court that the Plaintiff, at timing of this
23 writing, was not served with the **Defendant's Unopposed Motion to Continue Trial** in the
24 manner agreed upon by the parties in this matter.

1 **Respectfully submitted,**

2 DATED: July 31, 2025

3 Jaime Reborn

4 Name Printed

5
6 

7 Provide Signature (In Pro Se)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

As required by Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 6.3 and 9.5(b), (d), (e), I certify that I, Plaintiff, Jaime Reborn, have served this document, regarding **Case No.: 4-23CV-613-0**, for the following documents: **Notice of Clarification to Court Regarding Defendant's Motion to Continue Trial** on all other parties which are listed below on, July 31st, 2025, as follows:

Kyle Argenbright
General Litigation Division
209 W. 14th St., 6th Floor
Austin, TX 78701
kyle.argenbright@oag.texas.gov

In Lieu Of: University Of North Texas
1155 Union Circle, Denton, TX 76203-5017
Att: Legal Department of the University of North Texas

By (check all that apply)

☒ Regular mail

☒ email with delivery and/or read receipt(s)

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be "K. Argenbright", written over a horizontal line.

[Signature of certifying attorney or pro se party]

A handwritten date "7-31-2025" in dark ink, written over a horizontal line.

[Date]

NOTES: Pursuant to Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 6.3, a party's lead counsel must be served. Service on other attorneys for that party is optional, but must be listed above if they are served. Pursuant to Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 52.7(c), the record must be served on each party in an original proceeding.